

ATTY DOCKET NO.  
137264

DOC. ID  
137264A

11

#### REMARKS

##### Specification

1. The Examiner's Objection to the Specification has been studied and the Applicants have amended the Specification in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions as follows.

In paragraph 17, line 2, "2" was changed to "1".

In paragraph 18, line 3, "2" was changed to "1".

2. The Examiner's Objection to the Specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter (37 CFR 1.75(d) (p) and MPEP § 608.01(o)) has been studied and the Applicants have amended the Specification in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions as follows.

In Claim 21, line 6, "the" (first occurrence) was changed to "a".

In Claim 23, line 6, "the" (first occurrence) was changed to "a".

In Claim 26, line 6, "the" (first occurrence) was changed to "a".

In Claim 30, line 6, "the" (first occurrence) was changed to "a".

##### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

3. The Examiner's rejection of Claims 20-35 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention, has been studied and the Applicants have amended Claim 20, from which Claims 21-35 depend, to recite "asymmetric portions of the cooling apertures having asymmetrical densities of aperture inlets that are asymmetric with respect to the axially extending

ATTY DOCKET NO.  
137264

DOC. ID  
137264A

12

midlines.", thus, correcting the inaccuracy pointed out by the Examiner and eliminating the insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the Claim.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments and remarks above overcome the Examiner's rejection of Claims 20-35 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention, and that Claims 20-35 are now in condition for allowance.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102**

4. The Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-6 and 10-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Lee 6,155,778 (figures 1-2 and 4), has been studied and the Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's contention that Lee discloses "an asymmetric portion B of the cooling apertures having an asymmetrical density of aperture inlets that is asymmetric with respect to the axially extending midline." It is clear from observing the cooling apertures in Lee that in any given panel all of the cooling holes are equally spaced apart in any given row which crosses line 12 and thus there is no "asymmetrical density of aperture inlets that is asymmetric with respect to the axially extending midline." All of the densities of holes with respect to midline 12 are symmetric. While there may not be the same number of holes on the two sides of midline 12 in any given row of holes they are still all spaced equally apart and therefore the density of holes on either side midline 12 is the same and thus symmetrical not asymmetrical across midline 12. The Applicants respectfully submit that all of the cooling holes in Lee are spaced equally apart and Lee does not disclose any high density areas of the

ATTY DOCKET NO.  
137264

DOC. ID  
137264A

13

cooling apertures.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments and remarks above overcome the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-6 and 10-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Lee 6,155,778 and that Claims 1-6 and 10-17 are now in condition for allowance.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103(a)**

5. The Examiner's rejection of Claims 20 and 23-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee 6,155,778 in view of Proctor 5,169,287 has been studied and the Applicants respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. As shown above Lee does not teach, disclose, suggest, or even hint at an "asymmetrical density of aperture inlets that is asymmetric with respect to the axially extending midline." All of the densities of holes in Lee are symmetric with respect to midline 12. The Applicants respectfully submit that all of the cooling holes in Lee are spaced equally apart and Lee does not disclose any high density areas of the cooling apertures.

Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments and remarks above overcome the Examiner's rejections of Claims 20 and 23-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee 6,155,778 in view of Proctor 5,169,287 and that these Claims are in condition for allowance.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

6. The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for provisional allowance of Claims 7-9, 18-19, 21-22, and 30-35 and respectfully submit that it is too early in the prosecution to rewrite these Claims in independent form where appropriate,

ATTY DOCKET NO.  
137264


DOC. ID  
137264A

14

including all of the limitations of the base Claim and any intervening Claims. The Applicants amended the Claims to overcome all objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph.

7. The Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claims 1-35 are now in condition for allowance and request that they be passed on to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven J. Rosen  
Attorney for the Applicants  
Reg. No. 29,972

December 20, 2005

4729 Cornell Rd.  
Cincinnati, OH 45241

Phone: (513) 489-5383  
FAX: (513) 489-5466